DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 958 JC 820 337

AUTHOR Holleman, John J.
TITLE Development of an Instrument for the Evaluation of Certificated Personnel for Vista College.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 51p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; *Evaluation Criteria; *Faculty Evaluation; Measures (Individuals); Peer Evaluation; *Performance Factors; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Teacher Effectiveness; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Vista College CA

ABSTRACT

In response to a California legislative mandate and in the absence of agreed upon procedures for peer evaluation, Vista College undertook a survey of instruments utilized by other colleges and institutions for faculty evaluation. Evaluation forms were requested from 12 colleges and a total of 18 forms were received. These forms, and two obtained from non-collegiate firms, were compared in an item analysis with eight criteria established by the Board of Trustees of the Peralta Community College District and with two other sources listing important factors in teaching. The study showed that while there was a variation in the formats used and different emphases in the evaluation items, there were items that a number of forms had in common, including professional responsibility to students and peers (52%) and preparation and organization (48%). The non-collegiate evaluation forms covered more than 60% of the criteria established by the district. As a result of the analysis of the instruments, Vista developed three evaluation forms covering Student Evaluation of Instruction, Instructors' Self Evaluation, and Faculty Evaluation of Instruction. The first two forms were used during 1979 and elicited favorable responses from faculty and students. The peer evaluation instrument has not yet been used. Appendices include a list of the evaluation instruments analyzed and the evaluation forms developed at Vista College. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED217958

DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT FOR THE EVALUATION OF CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL FOR VISTA COLLEGE

COLLEGE GOVERNANCE MODULE

BY

JOHN J. HOLLEMAN, M.A.
VISTA COLLEGE

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

JC 820 337

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John J. Holleman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NOVA UNIVERSITY

NOVEMBER, 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	iii
Introduction	1
Background and Significance	4
Procedures	10
Results	13
Discussion, Implications, and Recommendations	25
Bibliography	28
Appendix A. List of Evaluation Instruments Analyzed	31
Appendix B. Vista College Student Evaluation of Instruction	34
Appendix C. Vista College Instructors' Self-Evaluation	37
Appendix D. Vista College Faculty Evaluation of Instruction	39

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.	Comparison of the Peralta Colleges Board Policy Manual Criteria with the Evaluation Forms Analyzed.....	14
Table 2.	Comparison of the R. I. Miller's "Student Appraisal of Teaching" with the Evaluation Forms Analyzed.....	16
Table 3.	Comparison of Peralta Colleges Board Policy Manual Criteria with Two Non-collegiate Evaluation Instruments.....	17
Table 4.	Comparison of the University of Toldedo's Office of Instructional Research's Twelve Highest Criteria for Effective Teaching with the Evaluation Forms Analyzed.....	19
Table 5.	Comparison of Peer Evaluation Instruments with R. I. Miller's "Classroom Visitation Appraisal" Form.....	21
Table 6.	A Comparison on the Format of the Evaluation Instrument Analyzed.....	23

ABSTRACT

The Board of Trustees of the Peralta Community College District requires all certificated employees to be evaluated on a biennial basis. Procedures and guidelines for the evaluation of faculty were developed by the Chancellor's office of the district. Included was a student evaluation form of faculty but no form for peer evaluation. Vista College did not have effective evaluation forms or procedures as required. The expansion experienced by the college in 1977-1978 could not be accommodated by the existing procedures and evaluation form.

Evaluation forms were requested from twelve colleges. Eighteen forms were received. The forms and two evaluation forms developed by non-collegiate firms were compared in an item analysis with the eight criteria established by the Board of Trustees Peralta Community College District.

The eighteen forms were also compared to R. I. Miller's "Student Appraisal of Teaching" and the University of Toledo's Office of Instructional Research's twelve most important factors in teaching.

The results of the analysis showed that while there is a variation in the formats used in evaluation forms and different emphasis in the evaluation items, there were items that a number of forms had in common. The analysis provided

information for the development of three evaluation forms. Student Evaluation of Instruction, Instructors' Self-Evaluation and Faculty Evaluation of Instruction.

The Student Evaluation of Instruction and Instructors' Self-Evaluation forms were used during 1979. Student and faculty reaction was very favorable. The Student Evaluation of Instruction was revised to elicit more responses from students. The revised form and the self-evaluation and peer evaluation form will be used in 1980.

INTRODUCTION

The Board of Trustees of the Peralta Community College District approved on November 20, 1972 the "Guidelines for Evaluation" for all certificated and administrative personnel. The guidelines, structured to meet the State of California requirements as specified in the Rodda Act of 1972, were made district policy and included in the Peralta Community College District Board of Trustees Policy Manual.

The introduction to the guidelines states that "The basic reason for evaluation is the improvement of professional competence. Each certificated employee shall be evaluated regularly by his peers in the college community on a basis appropriate to his employment relationship."[1] Specifics of the guidelines state "All certificated employees... shall be evaluated at least as often as required by law by a committee of their peers. The law requires...at least once a year. The Faculty....of each college shall devise a uniform method whereby the students served by each faculty member shall have the opportunity to evaluate his effectiveness." The Board of Trustees then delegates to the "...faculty academic units, divisions/departments" responsibility for implementing the guidelines.

1. The Peralta Colleges Board Policy Manual; 11-72:3.10, 1965.

The Chancellor's Office of the Peralta Community College District developed the procedure to be used in implementing the evaluation guidelines. These procedures were approved by the Board of Trustees on November 20, 1972.

Thus a set of guidelines and procedures are available for the evaluation of the certificated faculty. However the Chancellor's Office did not provide an instrument for the peer evaluation process. Vista College created by the Board of Trustees of the Peralta Community College District in 1974 as Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study does not have an instrument developed for the evaluation of faculty.[2] Evaluation forms used by other colleges within the Peralta District require a written statement of classroom activity observed and assessment of that activity. The use of this form in the evaluation process has resulted in a lack of objective evaluation and has minimized the effectiveness of the evaluation process.

2. The practicum proposal proposed the development of an evaluation form for Merritt College of the Peralta Community College District. In the Fall of 1977, the author became president of Vista College of the district. The practricum study was then undertaken at Vista College.

A study was undertaken to develop an evaluation form for certificated personnel of Vista College. Evaluation forms were obtained from twelve colleges. Eighteen evaluation forms were analyzed and compared to criteria established by the Board of Trustees Peralta Community College District. This analysis provided the basis for the development of an evaluation form with the purpose of improving the professional competence of the certificated faculty. The proposed evaluation form involved three parts; first, a self evaluation by the instructor; second, an evaluation by peers; and third, an evaluation by students.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Faculty evaluation is not a new issue; however it is not one that has been faced squarely. Next to collective bargaining faculty evaluation may be the most sensitive area in the Peralta Community College District. However, it is an area that the community served by the district believes is needed and essential.

Evaluation became an issue in the 1972 legislative session with the introduction of Senate Bill 696 by Senator Rodda. The legislation was the result of a need for a continuing evaluation process of instruction. This need was the expression of concerns by the constituency served by the California Community Colleges. This can be seen in what Kerr said: "cost-effectiveness of operations will be more carefully examined. If this is not done internally, it will be done externally by the new experts working for legislatures and governors."[3] With accountability as a basic consideration of effective management demands for more frequent and improved methods of evaluation will be sought.

3. Opinion expressed by C. Kerr, educator and author, in an address at American Association of Higher Education, 1971.

C. Rose states that the faculty must first answer the questions, "To whom is higher education accountable? And for what?"[4] The faculty must realize that they are accountable to the students for a high quality of education.

Heinberg[5], Vandervert[6] and others have stressed that evaluation should be used to improve instruction. The evaluation process should not be one that threatens the faculty members' security and financial status.[7]

The trend for academic accountability and evaluation has its parallel in the business sphere with performance appraisal. Levinson states that performance appraisal has "three basic functions: (1) to provide adequate feedback to each person on his or her performance; (2) to serve as a

4. C. Rose, "Stalking the Perfect Teacher," The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 4, 1976, p.24.

5. S. Heinberg, Procedures for the Supervision and Evaluation of New Part-Time Evening Division Instructors in California Junior Colleges, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966.)

6. L. R. Vandervert, Student Evaluation of Instruction: Some Theoretical Considerations and a Proposal, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 093 394, March, 1974.

7. R. C. Richardson, Jr., "Can Faculty Evaluation Improve Instruction?" Community and Junior College Journal, 44:3, November, 1973, p. 19.

basis for modifying or changing behavior toward more effective working habits; and (3) to provide data to managers with which they may judge future job assignments and compensation."[8] These three functions are the same as expressed by Miller as individualized evaluation and management and utilization of evaluative data.[9] Gage identified three reasons for evaluating teaching: a need to provide a basis for administrative decisions on promotions, salaries and tenure; for improvement and development; and to provide data for further research on teaching and learning.[10] Centra states that evaluation of faculty performance should be used to make personnel decisions and to improve faculty performance in their various activities.[11]

The Peralta Colleges Guidelines for Evaluation state that "...each college shall devise a uniform method whereby the students served by each faculty member shall have the

---

8. H. Levinson, "Appraisal of What Performance?" Harvard Business Review. July/August 1976 p.30.

9. R. I. Miller, "Evaluating Faculty Performance," (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass 1974), pp. 12-15

10. N. L. Gage, "Ends and Means in Appraising College Teaching," in W. J. MacKeachie (Ed.), The Appraisal of Teaching in Large Universities, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1959.

11. J. A. Centra, Determining Faculty Effectiveness, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass 1979), p. 16.

opportunity to evaluate his effectiveness."[12] The evaluation of faculty by students at Vista College has not been consistently done. The college was not prepared administratively to handle the evaluation of a six-fold increase in the number of temporary part-time faculty experienced in the academic year 1977-1978, and then another two-fold increase in 1978-1979.

Presently the evaluation of an instructor by his peers is not being accomplished at the college, even though the district guidelines require that a regular peer evaluation be conducted. Cohen questions the value of peer evaluation even when the procedures are highly systematized and detailed.[13] The concern of faculty about evaluation is that no matter how it is approached it is a threat to self-esteem and that the results may be misued by the administration. However, Miller indicates that through the involvement of the faculty in the development of evaluation procedures the administration and faculty will be "...comfortable with the procedure and...believe it is reasonably fair."[14]

12. The Peralta Colleges Board Policy Manual; 11-72:3.10, 1965.

13. A. M. Cohen and Associates, A Constant Variable. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass 1971), p. 58.

14. R. I. Miller, op. cit., p. 19.

Administrative evaluation of faculty at Vista College is a necessary element in the total procedure because the ratio of regular to temporary part-time faculty is 3:200. This involvement of administrators in the evaluation process will create anxieties that the results will be used in a punitive manner. Richardson[15] warns against using the results in a punitive manner while Tadlock[16], Miller[17], Cohen[18] and others state that the purpose of evaluation is to improve professional competence and the instructional program.

Menard developed an instrument for evaluating faculty from two attitudinal questionnaires which determined the format and items that should be included in the instrument[19]. The questionnaires administered to 70 faculty

15. R. C. Richardson, Jr., op. cit., p. 19.

16. M. Tadlock, Evaluation As a Change Mechanism -- A Management Tool (Palo Alto: Tadlock Associates Inc., 1977, p. 1.

17. R. I. Miller, op. cit., p. 8.

18. A. M. Cohen and F. B. Brawer, "Evaluating Faculty", Change Magazine, Community Colleges, 4:7:33, September, 1972.

19. J. W. Menard. Developing an Instrument for Evaluating Faculty by Students, Colleagues, and Administrators at Rhode Island Junior College. An unpublished Practicum presented at Nova University Ed.D Program for Community Colleges Nova University, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. May, 1975, pp. 1-55.

and 200 students showed that the preferred format was multiple choice and that the items for inclusion closely paralleled the characteristics of effective instructors cited in the literature.

The evaluation instrument developed should include those elements that will provide the opportunity for the improvement of professional competence.

PROCEDURES

Evaluation instruments for faculty were solicited from twelve colleges representing three universities and four-year colleges and nine community colleges. Eighteen evaluation forms were received, eleven student evaluation of faculty forms, five peer evaluation forms, one self-evaluation and one administrator evaluation form.

An item analysis was performed on the evaluation forms and then the analysis was compared to criteria set forth by the Board of Trustees Peralta Community College District in their Guidelines for Evaluation. The items that were included in the analysis covered the areas of:

a. Knowledge and mastery of subject matter
b. Preparation and organization
c. Achievement of course objectives as defined in course outlines and catalog descriptions
d. Clarity of presentation
e. Communication with students of varying abilities
f. Encouragement of critical thinking
g. Clear and consistent methods and procedures
h. Professional responsibility to students and peers.

Two faculty evaluation forms, one developed by a research foundation and the other developed by a national testing service, were also compared in the same way as the college evaluation forms were to the criteria listed above.

The item analysis was also compared to R. I. Miller's Student Appraisal of Teaching[20] and to the twelve highest ratings and value factors of the University of Toledo's Office of Instructional Research Study completed in 1969.

A comparison of the item analysis was made to determine those items that were common to all student evaluation of faculty forms.

The one self-evaluation form was compared to the Self-Appraisal of Teaching developed by R. I. Miller.[20]

The peer evaluation forms were subjected to the same item analysis with the Classroom Visitation Appraisal and Teaching Materials and Procedures Appraisal forms developed by Miller.[20]

The evaluation forms were also categorized according to the type of response format.

20. R. I. Miller, op. cit., pp. 28-37.

The analysis of the evaluation forms provided the basis for the development of the three forms for use at Vista College. Two of the forms, Instructor's Self-evaluation and Student Evaluation of Instruction, were used in the Spring of 1979 and revised in the Fall of 1979 in response to comments by faculty and students. The Class/Peer Visit Evaluation form will not be used until Spring 1980.

RESULTS

The evaluation instruments from the twelve colleges (listed in Appendix A) were compared to the eight areas specified in the Peralta Colleges Board Policy Manual. Table 1 shows these comparison. Only Professional Responsibility to Students and Peers appears more than fifty-two percent (52%) of the instruments analyzed. Forty-eight percent (48%), 10 of 21, of the forms included Preparation and Organization as items for evaluation. Achievement of Course Objectives, Clarity of Presentation and Clear and Consistent Methods and Procedures were covered by more than thirty-three percent (33%) of the evaluation forms. Knowledge and Mastery of Subject, Encouragement of Critical Thinking and Communication with Students of Varying Abilities items appeared in less than twenty percent (20%) of the forms analyzed.

Table 2 compares the twenty-one evaluation instruments with R. I. Miller's criterion listed in "Student Appraisal of Teaching."[21]

Planned and organized, encouraged to seek help when needed, and reaction to student viewpoints that are different, occurred in forty-three percent of the evaluation instruments. Major course objectives clear, graded fairly,

21. R. I. Miller, op. cit., p. 28.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF THE PERALTA COLLEGES BOARD POLICY MANUAL CRITERIA WITH THE EVALUATION FORMS ANALYZED

	1	2	3	4	5a	5b	6	7a	7b	7c	8a	8b	9	10a	10b	10c	10d	11a	11b	12
Knowledge and Mastery of Subject						x					x								x	x
Preparation and Organization		x	x	x	x		x	x					x						x	x
Achievement of Course Objectives as defined in course outlines and category description	x		x		x	x	x	x		x	x									x
Clarity of Presentation	x	x	x	x		x							x						x	x
Communication with Students of Varying Abilities				x		x														
Encouragement of Critical Thinking		x					x			x										
Clear and Consistent Methods and Procedures	x			x		x				x			x				x		x	
Professional Responsibility to Students and Peers	x	x	x	x		x	x			x	x						x		x	x

LEGEND:

1. Colorado State University "Student Reaction Profile"
2. California State University and Colleges "Course Evaluation Questionnaire"
3. California State College Bakersfield "Student Opinionnaire of Courses and Instruction"
4. Associated Students of Grossmont College, Inc. "Teacher Evaluation"
5a. Skyline College "Faculty Evaluation"
5b. Skyline College "Instructor Evaluation Form Life Science Division"
6. American River College "A Survey of Instructor's Teaching Effectiveness"
7a. West Valley College "Format for Evaluatee's Statement of Philosophy, Objectives and Methodology"
7b. West Valley College "Format for Evaluation Report"
7c. West Valley College "Student Questionnaire for Evaluation of Instructors"
8a. Ohlone College "Student Evaluation of Instructor"
8b. Ohlone College "Student Evaluation of Course"
9. College of San Mateo "Probationary Teacher Evaluation"
10a. Merritt College "Summary Evaluation of Contract Instructors"
10b. Merritt College "Summary Evaluation of Hourly Instructors"
10c. Merritt College "Evaluation Form for Classroom Observations"
10d. Merritt College "Department of Biology Instructor's Evaluation"
11a. Peralta Community College District "Annual Performance Evaluation Administrative Personnel"
11b. Peralta Community College District "Faculty Evaluation by Students"
12. Rhode Island Junior College "Faculty Evaluation Questionnaire"

agreement between course objectives and lesson assignments and clarity of presentation occurred between twenty-five and thirty-three percent of the forms analyzed. Two items, Mastery of Course Content and Relevant Student Involvement in Class, appeared in nineteen percent of the analysis. Occurring in less than ten percent of the forms were class time well spent, encourage critical thinking, comparisons to other faculty of the department and the institution. Only the item attitude of classmates to the instructor failed to appear on any of the forms analyzed.

The comparison of the two non-collegiate evaluation instruments with the criteria established by the Peralta Colleges Board Policy Manual is illustrated in Table 3. The two evaluation forms covered more than sixty percent of the criteria established in the policy manual. The three items that both forms had in common were: clarity of presentation, clear and consistent methods and procedures, and professional responsibility to students and peers. The remaining criteria items appeared singularly, two in one and three in the second, in the evaluation instruments.

Table 4 compares the evaluation forms analyzed with the University of Toledo's Office of Institutional Research's twelve highest criteria for effective teaching. Thirty-eight percent of the forms analyzed had being well prepared

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF R. I. MILLER'S "STUDENT APPRAISAL OF TEACHING"
WITH THE EVALUATION FORMS ANALYZED

	1	2	3	4	5a	5b	6	7a	7b	7c	8a	8b	9	10a	10b	10c	10d	11a	11b	12
Major course objectives clear	x		x			x	x			x	x								x	
Agreement between course objectives and lesson assignments	x			x		x				x									x	
Class presentation planned and organized	x	x	x	x			x				x		x						x	
Clarity of presentation	x		x	x															x	x
Mastery of course content							x					x							x	x
Class time well used	x																			
Encourage critical thinking		x																		
Encouraged to seek help when needed	x	x	x			x	x			x	x						x			x
Encourage relevant student involvement in class			x	x		x													x	
Reaction to student viewpoints that differ from own attitude of classmates to instructor	x	x	x			x	x			x	x								x	x
Grades fairly				x		x	x			x							x			x
Comparison to other faculty of the department	x		x																	
Comparison to other faculty of the institution	x																			x

For Legend see page 14.

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF PERALTA COLLEGES BOARD POLICY MANUAL
CRITERIA WITH TWO NON-COLLEGIATE
EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

	1	2
Knowledge and mastery of subject	x	
Preparation and organization		x
Achievement of course objectives as defined in course outlines and catalog description		x
Clarity of presentation	x	x
Communication with students of varying abilities	x	
Encouragement of critical thinking		x
Clear and consistent methods and procedures	x	x
Professional responsibility to students and peers	x	x

LEGEND:

1. Purdue Research Foundation
2. Educational Testing Service "Student Instructional Report"

for class and being fair and reasonable to students in evaluation procedures included their evaluation responses. Three items, establishing sincere interest in subject being taught, motivating students to do their best and treating students with respect, appeared in twenty-nine percent of the forms compared. Items appearing in nineteen percent of the forms analyzed were: Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subject, Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve objectives of the course, Communicating effectively at levels appropriate to the preparedness of students, Organizing the course in logical fashion, acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability. Encouraging intelligent independent thought by students was included by ten percent of the forms analyzed. None of the forms included an item related to constructing tests which search for understanding on the part of students rather than rote memory ability.

The analysis and comparison of the one self-evaluation form did not yield information that was usable in the development of an instrument for Vista College. The form, West Valley College's "Format for Evaluatee's Statement of Philosophy Objectives and Methodology,"[22] contained

22. West Valley College, Format for Evaluatee's Statement of Philosophy, Objectives and Methodology. 1976

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO'S[20] OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH'S TWELVE HIGHEST CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING WITH THE EVALUATION FORMS ANALYZED

	1	2	3	4	5a	5b	6	7a	7b	7c	8a	8b	9	10a	10b	10c	10d	11a	11b	12
Being well prepared for class		x	x	x	x	x				x	x									x
Establishing sincere interest in subject being taught	x	x		x		x													x	x
Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subject				x		x					x								x	
Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve objectives of the course		x	x								x						x			
Constructing tests which search for understanding on the part of students rather than rote memory ability																				
Being fair and reasonable to students in evaluation procedures	x			x		x	x			x							x		x	x
Communicating effectively at levels appropriate to the preparedness of students				x			x				x									x
Encouraging intelligent independent thought by students	x									x										
Organizing the course in logical fashion	x			x			x												x	
Motivating students to do their best	x	x					x			x	x									x
Treating students with respect				x		x	x				x								x	x
Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability		x		x						x										x

For Legend see page 14.

20. University of Toledo, Office of Institutional Research (1969) in R. I. Miller, Evaluating Faculty Performance, San Francisco: Joseey-Bass 1974.

four statements that were to be responded to anectodally related to a specific area of assignment. Two broad statements, description of objectives and discuss procedures and methodology that are to be used to achieve objectives compared to sixty percent of the items of Miller's Self-Appraisal of Teaching."[24]

Six of the evaluation instruments analyzed were for peer evaluations, see Table 5. These instruments all related to classroom observations. Two of the forms had specific items which could be compared to Miller's form, Classroom Visitation Appraisal. The Skyline College Faculty Evaluation Report had six items or 60% of the items recommended by Miller. The Format for Evaluation Report of College of San Mateo had 30% or three items in common with Miller's form. The remaining four forms had the evaluator describing the activity taking place during the visit. The peer evaluation is then based on this observation.

The comparison of format used by the evaluation instruments is shown in Table 6. Forty-five percent, ten of twenty-two, of the forms were anecdotal with the remaining having the multiple choice format. Six of the twelve multiple choice instruments has the option that the instructor could add additional questions or change the questions

24. R. I. Miller, op. cit., p. 37.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF PEER EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS WITH
R. I. MILLER'S CLASSROOM VISITATION APPRAISAL" FORM[23]

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Major course objectives made clear	x					
Presentations well planned and organized	x		x			
Clarity of presentation	x		x			
Mastery of course content	x					
Class time well spent						
Encourage critical thinking						
Attitude of students in class toward professor						
Encourage relevant student involvement	x		x			
Accept student viewpoints that differ	x					
Was the visit at a time when able to fairly judge teaching-learning process						

LEGEND:

1. Skyline College, Faculty Evaluation Report
2. West Valley College, Format for Evaluation Report
3. College of San Mateo, Probationary Teacher Evaluation
4. Merritt College, Summary Evaluation of Contract Instructors
5. Merritt College, Summary Evaluation of Hourly Instructors
6. Merritt College, Evaluation Form for Classroom Observations

23. R. I. Miller, op. cit., p. 33.

listed. None of the evaluation instruments used a mixed format, that is anecdotal and multiple choice. Forty-one percent gave the evaluator the opportunity to make additional comments. The same six instruments that gave the option to add or change questions were also the ones that could be scored by a computer or optical scan scored.

As a result of the analyses of the evaluation instruments and comparing them with all the criteria set forth in the various rating and commercially prepared forms, three evaluation forms were developed, "Student Evaluation of Instruction," "Instructors' Self-Evaluation," and "Faculty Evaluation of Instruction."

The Vista College "Student Evaluation of Instruction", see Appendix B, form was designed to include both multiple choice and anecdotal responses. The statements for the multiple choice and anecdotal questions specifically covered the items set forth by the Peralta Colleges Board Policy Manual. In addition, other questions sought specific information about the class and reasons for taking the class. The "Student Evaluation of Instruction" was used in the Spring of 1979. As a result of comments made by faculty and students the form has undergone minor revisions. The revised form dated January 1980 is shown in Appendix B. The revised form will be used in 1980.

TABLE 6

A COMPARISON ON THE FORMAT OF THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT ANALYZED

	1	2	3	4	5a	5b	6	7a	7b	7c	8a	8b	9	10a	10b	10c	10d	11a	11b	12	13	14
Anecdotal					x			x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x				
Multiple Choice	x	x	x	x		x	x			x							x		x	x	x	x
Multiple Choice with the Option to Add Other Questions	x	x	x	x																	x	x
Mixed Format: Anecdotal and Multiple Choice																						
Additional Comments Requested				x		x	x			x	x						x		x	x		x
Computer or Opitcal Scanning to Compile Evaluation Report	x	x	x	x																	x	x

LEGEND:

Nos. 1 - 12 see Page 14.
13. Purdue Research Foundation, Instructor and Course Appraisal
14. Educational Testing Service, Student Instructional Report

The "Instructors' Self-Evaluation" form, see Appendix C, developed included a report of the student evaluation and solicited from the instructor information on the class and a reaction to the student evaluations. One item that was included on the form specifically requested faculty comments on the evaluation process that was being tried for the first time. The faculty responses to the new evaluation process was very favorable. After analyzing the faculty responses it was decided that a revision of the form was not necessary. The "Instructors' Self-Evaluation" form will be used in 1980.

A form for the peer evaluation was developed but has not been used. The "Faculty Evaluation of Instruction," Appendix D, form was designed to elicit responses to the major items that were found to be the criteria considered most important in the analysis of the evaluation instruments undertaken. The form was designed in a mixed format to provide a broad and directed evaluation. The items in the "Faculty Evaluation of Instruction" included those of the Peralta Colleges Board Policy Manual and specific questions or statements in order to obtain an objective and systematic evaluation.

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The rapid growth experienced by Vista College in the past thirty months has resulted in faculty evaluation not receiving the attention it should. The college in the Spring of 1977 employed thirty part-time istructors as its teaching faculty. In the Fall of 1977 the college expanded dramatically in response to new administrative support and direction. The evaluation of the faculty in the Spring of 1977 was conducted by the college administration by a form that was distributed to the students in class, and after their response collected by the instructor. The forms were then returned to the administration. The form and procedures were effective when the college had thirty faculty and approximately one thousand students.

In the academic year 1977-1978, the college increased its total course offering to 425 courses enrolling over 9000 students. The teaching faculty increased to 220 part-time and two full-time instructors. That the administration was not capable or prepared to implement an effective evaluation program is understood. The primary concern at this time was the development of instructional programs, support for a faculty who were new to the college and new to teaching (55-60 percent) and the development of college systems that would accept and accommodate the expansion.

The need for faculty evaluation was recognized by the college administration in 1978. The results of a previous evaluation attempts were reviewed and discarded as not serving the needs of a greatly expanded instructional program. A new approach to evaluation was decided on that would involve three parts, a self-evaluation, student evaluation and peer evaluation. It was recognized that the small number of full-time faculty, two, could not do all the peer evaluations of the part-time faculty. The peer evaluation will be conducted by the administration.

In an effort to determine the content and format of the three evaluation forms, an item comparison was made between evaluation forms of colleges, two non-collegiate evaluation intruments and the Peralta Colleges Board Policy Manual Criteria and R. I. Miller's criteria listed in "Evaluating Faculty Performance."[26]

The first results of the evaluation forms and procedures indicate that the students and faculty believe that the process is worthwhile. The student evaluation forms are distributed by the faculty. The faculty collect the forms, review them and then report the students' responses on their self-evaluation form. This procedure was set up in order to provide the faculty with the student evaluations. This

26. R. I. Miller, op. cit.

procedure of having the faculty report the responses of students was developed to remove the feeling that the responses were going to be used in a punitive manner. Coupled with reporting the student's evaluations, the instructor then reacts to the evaluations and presents ideas and statements on how they will improve their teaching. The instructors' statements to the students evaluation responses indicate that they consider the student evaluations as a valid expression of their performance.

The concept of evaluation is not as threatening to the Vista College part-time faculty as it might be to part-time faculty at other colleges in the Peralta Community College District. Eighty percent of the 220 part-time faculty are employed full-time or part-time at occupations other than teaching where evaluation based on performance is routine.

The evaluation procedures at Vista College and the three evaluation forms developed are the first steps in a process that will be undergoing constant review and revision in the future. Vista College as a non-campus community college employs over 220 part-time faculty teaching in 150-165 community locations. The administrative staff realizes the importance of quality instruction and is implementing the use of the three evaluation forms to improve instruction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Centra, J. A. Determining Faculty Effectivness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Cohen, A. M. and Associates. A Constant Variable. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Cohen, A. M. and F. B. Brawer. "Evaluating Faculty," Change Magazine, Community College, 4:7:33 (September 1972).

Gage, N. L. "Ends and Means in Appraising College Teaching." In W. J. McKeachie (Ed.), The Appraisal of Teaching in Large Universities. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1959.

Heinberg, S. "Procedures for the Supervision and Evaluation of New Part-time Evening Division Instructors in California Junior Colleges." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966.

Kerr, C. "Destiny - Not So Manifest." In G. K. Smith (Ed.), New Teaching, New Learning: Current Issues in Higher Education 1971. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Levinson, H. "Appraisal of What Performance?" Harvard Business Review. July/August 1976.

Menard, J. W. Developing an Instrument for Evaluating Faculty by Students, Colleagues, and Administrations at Rhode Island Junior College. Unpublished Practicum, Nova University 1975.

Miller, R. I. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass 1975.

The Peralta Community College District. The Peralta Colleges Board Policy Manual. Peralta Community College District. Oakland, California 1965.

Richardson, R. C., Jr. "Can Faculty Evaluation Improve Instruction?" Community and Junior College Journal 44 (November, 1973).

Rose, C. "Stalking the Perfect Teacher." The Chronicle of Higher Education. October 4, 1976.

Tadlock, M. R. Evaluation as a Change Mechanism -- A Management Tool. Palo Alto: Tadlock Associates, Inc., 1977.

Vandervert, L. R. Student Evaluation of Instruction: Some Theoretical Considerations and a Proposal. U.S., Education Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 093 394, March 1974.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS ANALYZED

American River College. "A Survey of Instructor's Teaching Effectiveness." A student evaluation form.

California State College: Bakersfield. "Student Questionnaire of Courses and Instruction." A student evaluation form.

California State University and Colleges. "Course Evaluation Questionnaire." A student evaluation form.

College of San Mateo. "Probationary Teacher Evaluation." A peer evaluation form.

Colorado State University. "Student Reaction Profile." A student evaluation form.

Educational Testing Service. "Student Instructional Report." A student evaluation form.

Grossmont College, Associated Students of. "Teacher Evaluation." A student evaluation form.

Merritt College. "Summary Evaluation of Contract Instructors." A peer evaluation form.
"Summary Evaluation of Hourly Instructors." A peer evaluation form.
"Evaluation Form for Classroom Observations." A peer evaluation form.
"Department of Biology Instructor's Evaluation." A student evaluation form.

Ohlone College. "Student Evaluation of Instructor." A student evaluation form.

Purdue Research Foundation. "Instructor and Course Appraisal." A student evaluation form.

Rhode Island Junior College. "Faculty Evaluation Questionnaire." A student evaluation form.

Skyline College. "Faculty Evaluation Report." A peer evaluation form.
"Life Science Division Instructor Evaluation Form." A student evaluation form.

The Peralta Colleges. "Annual Performance Evaluation Administrative Personnel." An administrative evaluation form.
"Faculty Evaluation by Student." A student evaluation form.

West Valley College. "Format for Evaluatee's Statement of Philosophy, Objectives and Methodolgy." A self-evaluation form.
"Format for Evaluation Report." A peer evaluation form.
"Student Questionnaire for Evaluation of Instructor." A student evaluation form.

APPENDIX B

VISTA COLLEGE

STUDENT EVALUATIION OF INSTRUCTION

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

What students think about instructors at Vista College is important. Please help us learn what you think about the class you are taking. Your answers will help your instructor and the college improve future classes. Your answers are confidential; there is no need to write your name on this form. Thank you for your help.

	A Strongly Agree	B Agree	C Somewhat Agree but Needs to be Improved	D Disagree Needs to be Improved	E Not Applicable
1. Objectives, requirements and expectations for the class are clearly stated.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. Textbooks and/or reading materials are appropriate.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. The instructor is interested in students and is willing to help them learn.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. The instructor is enthusiastic.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. The instructor is well informed and has current knowledge of the subject matter.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. The instructor encourages student participation and welcomes questions, discussion and different points of view.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. Materials are presented in an organized manner.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. The instructor maintains a high level of student interest in the class.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9. The instructor is well prepared for each class.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. The methods for evaluating student progress and performance are clearly stated.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

11. Why are you taking this class?

( ) for general interest; for my own enjoyment.

( ) to learn skills to help me in my present work (inservice).

( ) to learn new skills to upgrade on my job or to possibly change jobs in the future.

12. How has the level of the class been for you?

( ) too easy.

( ) about right.

( ) too difficult.

13. How has the instructor's pace been?

( ) too fast.

( ) about right.

( ) too slow.

14. Overall, how would you rate the value of this class?

( ) Very valuable.

( ) Somewhat valuable.

( ) Little or no value.

15. What have you liked most about the class?

16. What have you liked least about the class?

17. How would you recommend that the instructor improve his/her teaching?

18. Other comments.

VISTA COLLEGE

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

What students think about instructors at Vista College is important. Please help us learn what you think about the class you are taking. Your answers will help your instructor and the college improve future classes. Your answers are confidential; there is no need to write your name on this form. Thank you for your help.

For Items 1-14, please blacken one response number for each statement.

SA Strongly Agree with statement made about instructor or course.
A Agree with the statement made about instruction or course.
D Somewhat disagree but needs to be improved.
SD Strongly disagree with statement made. Needs improvement.
NA Not applicable or don't know.

	SA	A	D	SD	NA
1. Objectives, requirements and expectations for the class are clearly stated.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. The instructor is well informed and has current knowledge of the subject matter.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. The instructor is well prepared for each class.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. The instructor presents the material clearly.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. The material is presented in an organized manner.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. The instructor used class time well.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. The instructor is interested in students and is willing to help them learn.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. The instructor encourages student participation and welcomes questions, discussion and different points of view.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9. The instructor maintains a high level of student in the class.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. The methods of evaluating student progress and performance are clearly stated.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. The instructor encourages students to think critically..	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. The instructor is enthusiastic.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
13. The instructor is aware of the varying levels and abilities of students.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
14. The textbook and/or reading materials are appropriate for the course.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

15. Why are you taking this class?

( ) for general interest; for my own enjoyment.

( ) to learn skills to help me in my present work (in-service).

( ) to learn new skills to upgrade on my job or to possibly change jobs in the future.

16. How has the level of the class been for you?

( ) too easy.

( ) about right.

( ) too difficult.

17. How has the instructor's pace been?

( ) too fast.

( ) about right.

( ) too slow.

18. Overall, how would you rate the value of this class?

( ) Very valuable.

( ) Somewhat valuable.

( ) Little or no value.

19. What have you liked most about the class?

20. What have you liked least about the class?

21. How would you recommend that the instructor improve his/her teaching?

22. Other comments.

Revised January, 1980

APPENDIX C

VISTA COLLEGE

INSTRUCTORS' SELF-EVALUATION

INSTRUCTORS' SELF-EVALUATION

NAME: _____ DATE: _____

COURSE TITLE: _____ NUMBER OF UNITS: _____

A. What have been three things that you were pleased with about your teaching?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

B. If you were to tezch this class again, what would be some things that you would want to work on to make it better?

C. How many students initially registered in your class? _____

How many do you estimate will finish? _____

What was the population of the class? _____

( ) primarily Elders (people enrolled in the Elders program).

( ) primarily Disabled Adults.

( ) primarily a mix of the general adult population.

D. Student Evaluation. After your students complete their evaluation forms, tally their responses here. How many responded? _____

QUESTION	TALLY OF RESPONSES				
	SA	A	D	SD	NA
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					
11.					
12.					
13.					
14.			47		

Additional Student Responses - 2

15. Why taking class: _____general interest _____to learn skills (in-service)

_____to upgrade or change jobs.

16. Level of class: _____too easy. _____about right.

_____too difficult.

17. Pace: _____too fast, _____about right, _____too slow.

18. Value: _____very valuable, _____somewhat valuable,

_____not very valuable.

You received a variety of responsed from students on questions Nos. 19, 20, 21 and 22. Please list those responses that were most helpful to you.

19. What students like most.

20. What students liked least.

21. Recommendations for improvement.

22. Comments.

E. What did you learn from the students; evaluation that would influence your teaching in the future?

F. If you were to teach this class again, or to teach other classes, what ways could the college be helpful to you in relation to the improvement of teaching?

( ) I would like a peer teacher to visit my classes to critique methods and process for me.

( ) I would like more seminars, workshops on teaching/learning.

( ) Other, please describe:_____

_____

G. What have you thought about this evaluation process? Do you have suggestions for improvements? Please comment.

Thank you. Please return this form in envelope provided.

Revised January, 1980

APPENDIX D

VISTA COLLEGE

FACULTY EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

VISTA COLLEGE

FACULTY EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Instructor:_____ Date of Observation:_____

Course: _____ Activity observed (lecture, lab discussion)_____

Visitor:_____ Class location: _____

* *

The basic purpose of evaluation is the improvement of instruction. The evaluation is to be constructive with good performance qualities and achievements emphasized. Areas of weaknesses should be noted and suggestions for improvement are to be presented. Within a week of the class visit the evaluator will meet with the instructor to discuss the observation and recommendations.

* *

Directions:

All statements and questions should be rated. Outstanding and unusually effective instruction should receive the highest rating.

	Highest				Lowest	Not Applicable
1. Were the objectives of the class made clear.....	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2. Were important concepts and ideas presented clearly	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. Did the class activity demonstrate preparation and organization.....	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. Was the class time used effectively.....	5	4	3	2	1	NA
5. Did the instructor demonstrate knowledge and mastery of the subject matter.....	5	4	3	2	1	NA
6. Were students encouraged to use critical thinking and analysis.....	5	4	3	2	1	NA
7. Were clear and consistent methods and procedures evident in class.....	5	4	3	2	1	NA
8. Did the instructor involve students when relevant..	5	4	3	2	1	NA
9. Did the instructor recognize the need to communicate with students of varying abilities.....	5	4	3	2	1	NA
10. Did the instructor relate to the students as individuals.....	5	4	3	2	1	NA
11. Were the students attentive and interested in the class.....	5	4	3	2	1	NA

	Highest				Lowest	Not Applicable
12. The instructor enjoys teaching.....	5	4	3	2	1	NA
13. Did the instructor anticipate difficulties and prepare students beforehand.....	5	4	3	2	1	NA
14. Does the instructor emphasize ways of solving problems rather than solutions.....	5	4	3	2	1	NA
15. Does the instructor demonstrate that he/she is current with developments in his/her field.....	5	4	3	2	1	NA

16. Did the instructor use audio-visual materials? _____Yes _____No
Comment:

17. Does the instructor participate in

( ) campus activities that affect students?

( ) lectures and other events on campus?

( ) discussions about teaching in general?

18. Does the instructor

( ) meet with students informally out of class?

( ) conscientiously keep appointments with students?

( ) encourage students to talk with him/her on matters of concern?

Comment where appropriate in the spaces provided.

19. Instructor's strengths or areas for growth and/or development.

a. In curriculum and course development.

b. In instructional material development (class handouts, A-V materials, course or laboratory guides, etc.)

c. In professional growth

d. In relationship with college peers.

This evaluation has been reviewed with _____ on _____.

This evaluation has been prepared by: _____.
Signature of Evaluator Date

I have read this evaluation report: _____.
Signature of Instructor Date

AUG 13 1982
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36